

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 and 71-164 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 140-151 and 159-163 are withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to a non-elected invention. By this Amendment, Applicant cancels the non-elected claims. In addition, by this Amendment, Applicant adds claims 165 and 166, which are clearly supported throughout the specification.

Applicant editorially amends claims 89 and 130 to cure minor informalities noted by the Examiner. The amendments to claims 89 and 130 were made for reasons of precision of language and consistency, and do not narrow the literal scope of the claims and thus do not implicate an estoppel in the application of the doctrine of equivalents.

I. Preliminary Matter

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to indicate acceptance of the drawings filed with the application on January 18, 2002.

II. Summary of the Office Action

The Examiner withdrew the previous rejections. The Examiner, however, found new grounds for rejecting the claims. In particular, claims 89-112 and 130-139 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and claims 1-13, 71-139, 152-158 and 164 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 89-112 and 130-139 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Applicant thanks the Examiner for pointing out, with particularity, the aspects of the claim thought to be indefinite. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection in view of the self-explanatory claim amendments being made herein.

IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-13, 71-139, 152-158 and 164 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by newly cited U.S. Patent No. 5,253,166 to Dettelbach et al. (hereinafter “Dettelbach”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection in view of the following comments.

This response, at least initially, focuses on the independent claim 1. For example, claim 1, among a number of unique features, recites:

displaying a plurality of components received in said client computer, each of said plurality of components having a parameter;

selecting by a client at least one of the plurality of components;

manipulating by the client information for at least one parameter of the at least one selected component;...

calculating by the server a plurality of options, each of said plurality of options comprising at least one suboption that corresponds to a value of one of said selected ones of said components, the at least one suboption is selected in accordance with said received manipulated parameter information, each of the at least one suboption represents inventory manipulated by a seller in real-time;...

creating by the client a final option based on selecting at least two suboptions from at least two of the received plurality of options and requesting by the client a reservation of the created final option;

transmitting by the client computer to said server said created final option and the reservation request;

generating by the server a confirmation that the final option is reserved for the client in response to the transmitted reservation request...

For example, in an exemplary, non-limiting embodiment of the present invention, it is taught that the user can choose various options to customize a package for travel reservation. That is, in the conventional techniques, the user may choose from a number of packages or may need to reserve each component of the package separately. In the conventional techniques, there is no disclosure

of a user receiving various packages based on the input parameters and allowing the user to select components from various travel packages to obtain a customized package and making a reservation for the requested final package.

In short, the conventional techniques fail to teach or suggest having a user select a package with components such as an airline ticket and a hotel reservation, and in return, obtain a number of various packages (various combinations of the sub-options *i.e.*, airline tickets and hotel reservations), where the user can pick and choose various sub-options (airline tickets and hotel reservations) from different packages to arrive at a final option (to compose a customized package). The user is not provided with any flexibility over individual components of various packages. This exemplary, non-limiting embodiment is provided by way of an explanatory example only and is not intended to limit the scope of the claims in any way.

Dettelbach is an unrelated reference that deals with an improved record keeping system that obtains and stores already made customers reservations (*see* Abstract). In particular, Dettelbach discloses having a customer airline computer reservation system (hereinafter “CRS”), which is updated in real-time as the reservation are being made by the travel agents (col. 3, lines 36 to 45). At a predetermined scheduled time, the computer reservation system (CRS) dumps all data into the record keeping system 10 (Fig. 1A; col. 3, lines 46 to 57). The raw data file 12 is dumped into the record keeping system 10 (Fig. 3) via a device T (*e.g.*, modem). In the record keeping system 10, the raw data file 12 is then organized into a transfer file 20 (Fig. 4), which has a delineated record for each reservation (col. 4, lines 33 to 52).

1. No interactive communication between the systems

Dettelbach, however, fails to disclose or suggest interactive communication between a client computer and a server. In Dettelbach, at a scheduled time, the data from the CRS is simply dumped into the record keeping system 10. In Dettelbach, there is no disclosure or suggestion of a) “transmitting by the client computer to a server said manipulated parameter information one of the parameter information,” b) receiving by the client computer from said server the calculated plurality of options,” c) “transmitting by the client computer to said server said created final option,” and d) “transmitting by the server to the client computer the generated confirmation.” In other words, Dettelbach simply discloses an automated data dump and lacks any interactive communication between the server and the client computer. In short, in Dettelbach, the CRS transfers its data into a record keeping system 10 without any back and forth interaction.

2. No disclosure of marking a reservation

Furthermore, Dettelbach does not disclose or suggest “creating by a client a final option and requesting by the client a reservation of the created final option.” Dettelbach relates to “pre-travel” time which is the period between when the reservation is made and up to the actual departure time (col. 1, lines 25 to 28). In other words, Dettelbach relates to efficiently managing the already existing reservations (col. 2, lines 30 to 43). In short, Dettelbach does not disclose or suggest creating a final option and requesting a reservation of the created final option.

3. No calculation of various travel packages from the client input and No creation of the customized travel package from various travel packages

In addition, Dettelbach organizes raw data file 12 into records but there is no calculation of a number of options, selecting sub-options from various options so as to create a final option.

That is, Dettelbach simply discloses a record keeping system and organizing the reservation information for easy access and analysis. Dettelbach, however, is completely unrelated to creating a customize travel package. In short, Dettelbach does not disclose or suggest creating a final option from various sub-options within different options.

4. No disclosure of manipulation of a parameter within the selected component

Furthermore, Dettelbach discloses obtaining the raw data file 12 and organizing information therein into records. However, in Dettelbach, there is no “manipulating by the client information for at least one parameter of the at least one selected component.” In other words, in Dettelbach, the information is simply organized by it is not changed in any way *i.e.*, it is not input or edited. In short, the information in Fig. 3 of Dettelbach is organized into records (Fig. 4) and is not manipulated.

5. No Disclosure of Generating Confirmations

Also, Dettelbach discloses an existing reservation having a field for storing a confirmation number (col. 5, line 39 and col. 7, lines 57 to 60). However, Dettelbach deals with already existing reservations as such a field is provided for the confirmation numbers of the existing reservations. Dettelbach does not disclose or suggest generating a confirmation, as set forth in claim 1.

For at least these exemplary reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from Dettelbach. Claims 2-13 and 164 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

In addition, dependent claim 4 recites: “sorting by the server said calculated plurality of options according to price.” In Dettelbach, there is no disclosure or suggestion of sorting various

options by price. For at least this additional exemplary reason, claim 4 is patentably distinguishable from Dettelbach.

Dependent claim 164 recites: “when executing said calculating of the plurality of options, for each of the plurality of calculated options, checking by the server on-the-fly availability of the inventory corresponding to a suboption of the option being calculated.” In Dettelbach, which deals with an already existing reservations, there is no disclosure or suggestion of checking availability of the inventory when calculating the options. For at least this additional exemplary reasons, claim 164 is patentably distinguishable from Dettelbach.

Independent claims 71, 89, 113, 130, 152, 155, and 158 recite features similar to the features argued above with respect to claim 1. For at least analogous reasons, therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 71, 89, 113, 130, 152, 155, and 158, and their dependent claims 72-88, 90-112, 114-129, 131-139, 153, 154, 156, and 157 are patentably distinguishable from Dettelbach.

In view thereof, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection of claims 1-13, 71-139, 152-158, and 164.

V. New Claims

In order to provide more varied protection, Applicant adds claims 165 and 166, which are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1.

VI. Conclusion


In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appl. No. 10/031,405
Attorney Docket No.: A7736

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Nataliya Dvorson
Registration No. 56,616

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: November 20, 2006

Attorney Docket No.: A7736